



2818
JFW

Attorney Docket no: SEL 247

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
)
YAMAZAKI et al.)
)
Serial No.: 09/815,661)
)
Filed: March 23, 2001)
)
For: Method of Manufacturing A Light Emitting)
Device)
)
Examiner: S. Mulpuri)
)
Art Unit: 2812)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents ,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

September 28, 2004
(Date of Deposit)

Shannon Wallace

Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered Rep.

Shannon Wallace 9/28/04
Signature Date

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE D

Applicants have the following response to the Office Action of June 28, 2004.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-42 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “admitted prior art” in combination with Kim et al. and Fujitsu (a new reference). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Previously, Applicants explained why the claims were patentable over the combination of “admitted prior art” and Kim et al. In the Office Action, the Examiner has a section entitled “Response to Arguments.” In this section, the Examiner states that Applicants argue that the “admitted prior art” does not teach Cs ions. Applicants believe that there has been a miscommunication and wish to clarify their position. More specifically, it is Applicants’ position that the related art described in the specification (the so-called “admitted prior art” in the office